



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/509,608	11/12/2004	Leif Nilsson	SZAC.P0101US	7839
58342	7590	05/22/2008		
WARREN A. SKLAR (SOER)			EXAMINER	
RENNER, OTTO, BOISSELLE & SKLAR, LLP			KUMAR, SRILAKSHMI K	
1621 EUCLID AVENUE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
19TH FLOOR			2629	
CLEVELAND, OH 44115				
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/22/2008	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/509,608	<b>Applicant(s)</b> NILSSON ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b> SRILAKSHMI K. KUMAR	<b>Art Unit</b> 2629

**—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —**

THE REPLY FILED **18 April 2008** FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a)  The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2.  The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because

- (a)  They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b)  They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
- (c)  They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d)  They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: SEE CONTINUATION SHEET. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.

6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be entered, or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-18

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fail to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

12.  Note the attached *Information Disclosure Statement(s)*. (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.

13.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

/Sumati Lefkowitz/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2629

The proposed amendment to the claims adds the limitation of "solely". The proposed amendment will not be entered as it does not change the meaning of the claim. The definition of the word "soley" from dictionary.com states the following "exclusively or only". Consequently, the addition of solely just reiterates that the finger is removed and re-applied and does not further limit the claim. The addition of this limitation does not overcome the rejection of Wallace et al in view of AAPA and further in view of Bower as the limitation still reads on a double click. The limitation of the applicant's claim still reads on a double click function as "only" removing and re-applying the finger. Applicant argues on page 8 where the applicant's invention is not a double click. However, as stated above, the claimed limitation reads on a double click feature. Applicant on pages 7-8 argues the prior art separately. Applicant argues where the prior art of Wallace does not teach the feature of "navigating in a backwards direction in the hierarchically organized menu system by solely removing the finger from the movable physical member and re-applying the finger to the movable physical member within a set time limit". Wallace teaches navigating on an electronic device (col. 2, lines 46-55) and having a member (1) and removing a finger from the member and re-applying for navigating in col. 5, lines 6-33. Wallace doesn't teach hierarchically organized menu system. This feature is taught by Applicant's Admitted Prior Art on page 1, lines 22-25. The combination of Wallace and AAPA do not teach the feature of navigating backwards by removing the finger and re-applying the finger to the movable physical member within a set time limit. This feature is taught by Bower with the double click feature and where the navigation is backwards to the previous hyperlink or to other logical steps on the page. Examiner contends where the combination of the prior art teaches the claimed limitations. Therefore, the combination of Wallace et al, AAPA and Bower teach all the claimed limitations including the proposed amendment. Thus the rejection is maintained.